

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, claims 11, 14, and 17 are in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 11 and 14 have been amended to include the particulars of the null constraint method utilized by the present invention as set forth on pages 18 and 19 of the application as filed. Applicant submits that these amendments should not raise any new issues or require a new search. In this regard, the independent claims as previously presented referred to the null constraint method as described in the application as filed and is now inserted into the claims to more particularly point out the invention. Moreover, the amendments made here place the application in better condition for appeal. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

In rejecting independent claim 11 and 14, the Examiner asserts that Kasami discloses use of a null constraint method of the present invention. In reply, applicant notes that although this document appears to mention the term “null constraint,” Kasami nowhere mentions that the null constraint method recited by the claims of the present application is utilized.

Specifically, the section of Kasami referenced by the Examiner in the office action recites the use of registration signals when a new base station is introduced into an existing communications network. The registration signals allow the other base stations in the system to identify the location of the new base station and “constraint” conditions are then applied which allow each base station to place a null in the direction of the registration signal during future operation (see figure 30), thus, “blocking” signals from the potential interferers.

Kasami fails to teach a method by which the downlink beamforming weights are determined from the uplink beamforming weights as recited by the claims of the present application. Accordingly the office action does not set forth a prima facie case of obviousness because the references when combined do not disclose all of the features recited by the claims. In particular, the grounds set forth in the office action fail to disclose or suggest the specific null constraint method recited by the claims. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 11 and 14, as well as dependent claim 17.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Hancock Hughey LLP
/pwh #31,169/
Patrick W. Hughey
Registration No. 31,169
Tel. No. (503) 274-5455